



# HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL Historic District

3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

*Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning*

www.howardcountymd.gov

410-313-2350

FAX 410-313-1655

TDD 410-313-2323

## September Minutes

Thursday, September 3, 2015; 7:00 p.m.

The eighth regular meeting for the year 2015 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, September 3, 2015 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD.

Members present: Allan Shad, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; and Erica Zoren

Members absent: Eileen Tennor and Bruno Reich

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Lewis Taylor and Carol Stirn

Vice-Chairperson Shad opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Ms. Zoren moved to Approve the August 6, 2015 minutes. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **PLANS FOR APPROVAL**

\*Please note the following comments and recommendations are from DPZ Staff and are recommendations for the Commission to consider, they do not represent a decision made by the Commission.

### **AGENDA**

1. 14-18c – 2106 McKendree Road, West Friendship, HO-192
2. 15-49 – 8385 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-573
3. 15-50 – 6117 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge, HO-445
4. 15-51 – 15505 Cattail Oaks, Glenwood, HO-9
5. 15-52 – 3802 Church Road, Ellicott City
6. 15-45 – 3884 Ellicott Mills Drive, Ellicott City (continued from August)
7. 15-53 – 3880-3884 Ellicott Mills Drive (formerly 8448 Main Street), Ellicott City, HO-315

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **15-49 – 8385 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-573**

Install gate and counter.

Applicant: Jane Johnson

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT, the building dates to 1920 and is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-573. The business at 8385 Main Street, The Judge's Bench, received

approval from the Howard County Liquor Board for alcohol consumption on the side walkway. The Applicant proposes to add a customized black wrought iron gate to define the side exit of the building. The gate is 45 inches wide by 48 inches high and will sit 7 inches above the concrete sidewalk. The Applicant proposes to add a 10 inch deep by 17 feet long black metal counter to the exterior brick building. The overall brick wall is 23 feet and the counter will be installed 42 inches above the lowest part of the concrete sidewalk acting as a table surface for standing people.

**Staff Comments:** The Applicant wants a clearly defined area for people to stand outside with drinks without violating the Liquor Board boundaries and a wrought iron black metal gate will be installed at the end of the brick building before access to the public sidewalk. The Applicant seeks approval for the counter to serve as a resting space for food and beverages.

These materials comply with Chapter 9.D (page 70) recommendations, “install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal.” The Guidelines (page 69) explain “historic metal fences found in the historic district include wrought iron fences... simple metal fencing found along the railroad line...” The Application is consistent with the diagram in Chapter 9.D (page 68) illustrating “suitable fences for the historic district showing simple iron fences which this gate is created to be.” The counter will be made of black metal and can easily be removed in the future.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **15-50 – 6117 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge**

Install barn lights.

Applicant: Drew Roth

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT, the primary structure dates to 1932 and is on the Historic Sites Inventory as #HO-445 but this application is for an outbuilding on the property. The Applicant proposes to install lighting above each doorway of the barn. The Applicant is proposing a total of 5 exterior lights to be fastened to the barn above each doorway. The lights will be a galvanized gooseneck traditional in style to barns and historic structures. Each light will have a 12 inch shade and cast light downward to the door below it.

**Staff Comments:** The Lawyers Hill Guidelines Outdoor Lighting in Chapter 9.F states “new lighting should be unobstructive, in keeping with the historically rural character of the District.” “Shield Lighting so that it illuminates only the area intended and does not spill onto neighboring properties.” Avoid “lighting fixtures made of unpainted bright metal or other visually intrusive materials in the locations visible from public streets or neighboring houses.” Staff finds the lights to be in compliance to the Guidelines in color, scale, location and casting of light.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** Mr. Taylor stated this case is to be continued to the next scheduled meeting because of lack of quorum.

**15-51 – 15505 Cattail Oaks, Glenwood, HO-9**

Termite damaged exterior repairs, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Fiona Wilcox

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT, the building dates to 1747 and is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-9 and known as 'Round About Hills'. The Applicant has discovered extensive termite damage and proposes to make several repairs and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The Contractor has confirmed termite damage in the North Wall of the historic structure and proposes to remove all interior and exterior walls and replace with in-kind siding, windows, doors, framing, and any damage found in flooring, ceiling, supports, roof or foundation.

**Staff Comments:** The House's siding, windows, doors, framing, porch foundation, flooring, supports, rails, and roofing may be damaged by termites. The scope of work is unclear at this time until the professionals can remove damaged areas. The Applicant is seeking in-kind replacements for all wood materials and will salvage what is possible. The application is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, Standard 6, "where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and where possible, materials." The application is also consistent with Section 20.112 of the County Code which defines eligible work for tax credits as "the repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure" and "work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing."

The replacement of an asphalt roof with a standing seam metal roof is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, Standard 2, "the historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials...shall be avoided." The metal roofing was most likely originally on the structure and removed at one point, with the current asphalt roof replacing the original material. Therefore, going back to a metal roof is appropriate. The application is also consistent with Section 20.112 of the County Code which defines eligible work for tax credits as "the repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure" and "work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing."

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted; all tax credit approval for all structural and exterior repairs to the windows, walls, doors, porch, ceiling and structural features pertaining to the termite infestation using in-kind wood replacement materials and standing seam metal roof.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**14-18c – 2106 McKendree Road, West Friendship, HO-192**

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Steve Allnutt

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the house dates to about 1908. The Applicant proposes to make several exterior repairs and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The work will include:

- 1) Paint the exterior siding – the lower clapboard will be painted white and the upper fish scales will be a medium gray tone.
- 2) Sand and repaint existing vinyl shutters black, color will match the existing black.
- 3) Repair and paint metal roof black to match existing black
- 4) Replace exterior lights
- 5) Repoint brick on front steps
- 6) Prepare and paint front porch
- 7) Repair, replace and repaint exterior doors

The Applicant shows \$36,135.00 of total expenses for the renovation. The invoices submitted show that \$4,807.56 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$9,033.75 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approved but there are not enough adequate receipts proving payment of work. Staff recommends approval of 25% tax credits for \$4,807.56 which would be \$1,202.00.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval of the final tax credit for the amount of \$1,202.00 based on the receipts totaling \$4,807.56.

**Testimony:** The Applicant was not present. Ms. Burgess stated the Applicant submitted some receipts, but has not submitted all of them to show proof of \$36,135.00 claim. She has requested more information from the Applicant. Ms. Burgess calculated the tax credits as being less than what the Applicant claimed, but the Applicant can still get approval for what was handed in. The Commission and Staff discussed how to handle what was submitted. Ms. Burgess explained her conversation with the Applicant and how the receipts documentation worked. Mr. Taylor stated the Commission could continue this case until next month and ask the Applicant to return, or they could approve the submitted amount as the final, or approve with the stipulation that the Applicant can come back with more documentation. Mr. Taylor stated on the Staff recommendation that the wording be amended to *“recommends final approval of tax credits for the amount of \_\_\_\_\_, with the provision the Applicant can return if the additional documentation for the remainder of the amount can be located”*. The Commission felt the Applicant should be given the opportunity to come back. Ms. Burgess stated she is fine with giving the Applicant more time to provide proof of payment.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved for final approval of tax credits for the amount of \$1,202.00, with the provision the Applicant can return if the additional documentation for the remainder of the amount can be located. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **15-52 – 3802 Church Road, Ellicott City**

Replace roof and install AC unit.

Applicant: Diane Wimsatt

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT, the building dates to 1870. The Applicant proposes to replace the grade #1 wood shingle roof that was approved in July 1989 with a 30 year Charcoal Black Certainteed Landmark architectural asphalt shingle. The porch roof is a metal seam roof and will not be changed as it is noted as being in good condition. The Applicant proposes to use UDL RhinoRoof and will

also replace or add any plywood, flashing, pipe collars, shingle vents, caulking and drip edges as needed for a waterproof home. Staff notes the wood shingle roof is not original to the house. There was an existing asphalt roof before 1989 when it was renovated to be wood shingle that either has not worn well or was not installed properly, because the Applicant's photo shows rot and broken shingles that are no longer keeping the house waterproofed. The Applicant also proposes to remove air conditioning window units from the main section of the house and install either one 6-zone ductless or two 3-zone Mitsubishi AC/Heat systems, resulting in one or two small compressor units (approximately 30 inches by 20 inches by 10 inches) on the left (west) side of the house.

**Staff Comments:** The Guidelines Chapter 6.E (page 31) state "Asphalt shingles, introduced around 1910, are now the most commonly used roofing material. The original roof material has been replaced by asphalt shingles on many pre-1910 buildings." "Replace historic roof materials only when necessary due to extensive deterioration." The Applicant has chosen Charcoal Black shingle color but is open to the Commission's choice in a roof color. An in-kind wood shingle replacement would be eligible for the 25% tax credit.

Chapter 6.M (page 49) of the Guidelines states "whenever possible, install equipment (HVAC) out of sight of public ways or other properties." Staff finds the current AC units in the windows are unsightly and not appropriate for the Historic District. The removal of these units and use of the ductless AC/heat unit compressors are a great solution. The Applicant's house is on an intersection to Church and Emory Road so the west side of the house is the least exposed location from public view and is adjacent to a parking lot.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in Diane Wimsatt and Robert Wimsatt. Mr. Shad asked if there were any corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Wimsatt commented that the house was just purchased and they do not really understand the process. She understands that using wood shingles would qualify for tax credits, and wanted to ask if metal roofing would also qualify. Ms. Burgess stated metal roofing is a material that is accepted in the historic district depending if it works on the style of house and is appropriate. Ms. Burgess does feel a metal roof would be appropriate for the house. Ms. Wimsatt asked if an asphalt shingle is found that looks like wood, would this qualify for tax credits. Ms. Burgess said the tax credit is interpreted as 'in-kind' replacement. Since the replacement was not in-kind to the wood, it was not eligible. Mr. Taylor stated he is not aware of an asphalt shingle looking like wood, but does not feel it would qualify. The metal roof would be more appropriate to the historic area. Ms. Wimsatt stated they want to do something that will be durable and qualify for the tax credit. Both Mr. and Mrs. Wimsatt would prefer not to use wood being that it may not be as durable. Mr. Wimsatt showed some samples for the shingles. Ms. Burgess asked if the Applicants brought any samples with them regarding the metal roofing. Ms. Wimsatt did request a quote from a contractor, but does not have a sample. She would like the metal roof to look the same as on the porch and the same color.

Mr. Taylor explained that if a metal roof was to be used, the Commission would need to see the proposal of what the roof looks like before it could be approved. Mr. Taylor also explained, for the Applicants, the process of how tax credits work and what needs to be done to receive them. Mr. Taylor stated if the Commission wanted to approve the proposed asphalt shingle, they could. If the Applicants wanted to look into the metal roofing and the tax credits, they would need to come back for approval. Mr. Shad questioned if the metal roof would be acceptable if the Applicants wanted to go with it. Mr. Taylor felt the Commission would need to first see the presentation of what would be used. Ms.

Wimsatt stated going with the asphalt shingles would be fine, and she would check on the metal roof and the costs. If the metal costs more than the asphalt, then the asphalt will be used instead.

Ms. Wimsatt stated the contractor feels it would be better to do one outside air unit instead of two. She showed the Commission a photo sample of the air unit, which is not the same brand as originally stated. This unit would be sized 35 inches by 45 inches by 14 inches. Mr. Wimsatt stated this unit would take less space and be able to be better hidden.

Mr. Roth stated he is fine with the submitted proposal. Ms. Zoren stated she is fine with either the standing seam roof or the shingles. Ms. Zoren commented there are better shingles on the market that carry long-term durability and give a better architectural interest level. Ms. Wimsatt stated the shingles they are considering are actually for 30 years. Ms. Zoren asked about some small landscaped buffering in front of the air conditioning unit. Mr. Wimsatt stated the area of placement already has landscape buffering, but it could have additional landscaping. Mr. Shad is also fine with the proposal. He did mention that the color black was mentioned in the application, but asked if the Applicant wanted to consider a different color. Ms. Wimsatt stated the black shingle color is her choice.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application of black asphalt shingle roof, and the amended larger air conditioning unit. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **15-45 – 3884 Ellicott Mills Drive, Ellicott City (continued)**

Stairway installation to River.

Applicant: Lisa Wingate

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT, the historic house dates to 1800 and the barn dates to 2004 when it was torn down and rebuilt. The Applicant proposed in the August 2015 meeting application #15-45 to:

**“Remove the stepping stones to the river and add concrete block steps with railings.** The proposed steps/tread will be same top capped bullnose concrete block used for the top of the retaining walls. The steps will be in replacement to the stones from the top of the patio down to the river’s edge. A black metal double rail will be installed supported at intervals with no balusters.”

The Applicant has revised the scope of work to maintain the existing stepping stones with the exception of replacing 5-6 stones with more appropriate flat stepping stones to create a safer descent. The approximately 20 stones will be reviewed for leveling but will sit on the ground without foundations or footers. A single black metal rail will be installed to aid a person in their walk but overall it is proposed to be a natural, non-invasive pathway leading to the river’s edge.

**Staff Comments:** Staff noted concerns to infrastructure and disturbance to the river’s setback area and was recommending denial of permanent steps. Regarding steps, Chapter 9.D (page 68) recommends “Original materials, which include stone, brick and wood, should be preserved. Even if the original material has been replaced by a modern alternative such as concrete, the location, size and grade of these features are often important to the settings of historic buildings.” Beyond the Guidelines, Staff has concern of infrastructure and disturbance too close to the river based on Streams and Wetland Regulations having 75 feet perennial stream bank setbacks. Staffed measured the length of the path from the top of the patio berm to the river to be 40-45 feet. The first 6 feet is the climb to the top of the

berm and the next 25 feet is a steep descent to the flatter River's edge. Staff recommends approval of the natural stone pathway and metal railing if the railing installation stays within 30 feet of the top of the slope so that digging adjacent to the river can be avoided. The lower 10-15 feet of land by the River is more flat and open and a railing should not be that close to the River.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval of the 20 stone steps and the metal black railing with a maximum length of 30 feet of railing from the edge of the patio down the steep slope to maintain a setback from the River's edge.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in Ms. Wingate and Mr. Steensen. Mr. Shad asked if there were any corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Wingate stated no; the Applicant is fine with the proposal. Mr. Taylor clarified that Ms. Wingate and Mr. Steensen agree with the recommended 20 stones and 30 feet of railing. Ms. Wingate and Mr. Steensen said yes. Ms. Zoren stated she likes the stone steps much better.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve per Staff recommendations. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **15-53 – 3880-3884 Ellicott Mills, Ellicott City HO-315**

Installation of retaining walls, handrails, fence, and enclose gas meter.

Applicant: Lisa Wingate

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT, the historic house dates to 1800. The Applicant seeks approval for the following at 3880 Ellicott Mills Drive:

1. House retaining wall: Retroactive approval for a parged concrete retaining wall 31 feet long that is 12 inches thick with 3 tiers having heights ranging from 13 inches to 22 inches. This was installed to prevent the hillside erosion. The materials match existing approved materials: the bullnose pavers, and parging of adjacent new construction building foundation, painted same the creamy buff color.
2. Railings: The installation of an ornate black metal iron railing in the back of the house from the French doors to the patio and if required by inspector, a single black metal rail at the French doors to the back porch.
3. Fencing: A white picket fence adjacent to the driveway south edge at the top of the slope west of the Barn. This fence will be a wood fence painted white with copper post caps, 24 feet in length and 3 feet high.

The Applicant proposes the following at 3884 Ellicott Mills Drive:

4. Gas meter screen: Build an 8 feet wide by 6 foot high poplar wood fence enclosure made from 11 inch wide vertical planks with double doors to access existing gas lines and meters located at northeast corner of the barn. Open on top (no roof) and open at base as necessary to permit double doors to swing freely.
5. Barn retaining walls: Curbing the asphalt drive or using railroad ties are proposed to stop or slow run-off from the upper house lot. Applicant seeks approval for up to 3 additional retaining walls on the wooded slope located southwest of the barn, each up to 12 feet long by up to 18

inches high and made of Nicolock Firma system in the Granite City Blend color with a cap of the same material.

6. Barn steps, railing and picket fence: East of the barn is an existing patio parking pad with a picket fence. Add four additional flagstone steps at the top of the existing stairs to complete the elevation transition. In lieu of previously approved railing attached to stone wall, install a single, free-standing black metal handrail at outer curve of these steps. Install an additional white, wood, picket fence extending 5 feet in length from the existing fence east of the barn below barn's parking pad.
7. Retaining walls by driveway: Stones unearthed on site will be used to extend the existing retaining wall off the northeast corner of the barn east by 7 feet. This wall between the driveway and barn patio/parking pad is 18 inches high at the western high side and diminishes to 4 inches at the east end. Also the existing stone wall south of the patio will be extended to the east by 7 feet using unearthed existing stones.

**Staff Comments:** The application generally complies with the Guidelines:

1. House retaining wall: The Guidelines state (page 67) "Because of Ellicott's City hilly terrain, retaining walls, terraces and steps are common throughout the town." (page 69) "Concrete walls can be used in locations with very little visibility." (page 71) "Build a new retaining wall no more than 2 feet high and 12 feet long." Although this wall is 31 feet in length, it is tiered into 3 heights breaking up the length and it is not visible from the front of the house. The wall is aiding the support of the slope and preventing run-off to the walkout basement. The wall is not visible from the public way and is in keeping with the color and materials of the historic district and features on site. Staff recommends retroactive Approval of the retaining wall with the concrete bullnose capping.
2. Railings: Railings are required when there are more than 3 steps. These black metal railing materials comply with Chapter 9.D (page 70) recommendations being, "of wood or dark metal." The Guidelines (page 69) explain "historic metal fences found in the historic district include wrought iron fences, the ornate cast iron fences that became common in the 1840s...new fences that emulate these older metal fences are appropriate for many areas of the historic district...for formal residences." Staff recommends Approval of the ornate rail and the simple black metal rail for the back patio steps.
3. Fence: Chapter 9.D (page 69) of the Guidelines states "a simple, painted picket fence is suitable for many of the district's residences." And retain "wrought iron, cast iron and wooden picket fences from the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century (page 68)." The addition of a white picket fence complies with the Guidelines. Staff recommends Approval of the fence.
4. Screen: Chapter 6.M (page 49) of the Guidelines states "whenever possible, install equipment (HVAC) out of sight of public ways or other properties." With this property subdivided, the main historic house front porch now faces the gas meter. Staff recommends Approval of wood fence screening of the gas meter area.
5. Barn Retaining Wall: The proposed terraced garden complies with Chapter 9.A recommendations (page 63), "minimize grading by siting new structures and other improvements to make use of the land's natural contours. When necessary, use appropriately designed retaining walls... to create the minimum level area needed for a new use in accordance



with historic preservation development patterns” and “maintain and reinforce natural landscape elements such as rock outcroppings, water courses and tree lines.” The terraced slope will maximize use of the hillside, while also improving erosion control. Staff recommends Approval of the potential 3 retaining walls to address run-off and steep slope stabilization.

6. Barn steps, railing and fence: The choice of stone steps, metal railing and picket fence all comply with the Guidelines. The Guidelines state (page 67) “Because of Ellicott’s City hilly terrain, retaining walls, terraces and steps are common throughout the town.” Chapter 9.D (page 70) recommendations, “install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal” Chapter 9.D (page 69) of the Guidelines states “a simple, painted picket fence is suitable for many of the district’s residences.” Staff recommends Approval of the stone steps, metal railing and picket fence.
7. Driveway retaining wall: Using rock to extend the wall complies with the Guidelines which state (page 67) “Because of Ellicott’s City hilly terrain, retaining walls, terraces and steps are common throughout the town.” (page 70) “When possible, reuse the historic building materials to repair or restore... Construct new terraces of stone or concrete pavers designed to look like indigenous stone.” Staff recommends Approval of the expansion of the rock walls.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted of items #1-7.

**Testimony:** Ms. Wingate and Mr. Steensen are still sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if there were any corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Wingate asked to make sure all this information is placed in both files for the two addresses, in the event of an ownership change so the new owners are aware of the changes and know what was approved. The Commission went through each of the Staff comments for items #1-7.

# 1 – House Retaining Wall: The Commission has no objection. Ms. Zoren commented that it would be better to parge the wall with the color added in the mix instead of painting the parged wall.

# 2 – Railings: The Commission has no objection.

# 3 – Fence: Ms. Wingate commented the picket fence goes across the south side of the driveway to the west of the barn, but is on the house lot. Mr. Roth said the fence visually connects to the house. Ms. Wingate corrected the fence visually connects to the barn. Because of the way the lot lines are drawn, the fence is part of the house lot. The Commission has no objection.

# 4 – Screen: Ms. Wingate stated the screen will be open at the top, and the bottom would be down as low as possible, but the doors need to be cut up so they do not hit the hillside when open. The screening will be low, but the opening must be functional. Ms. Wingate stated after a period of weathering, the screen will blend in with the siding. The Commission has no objection.

# 5 – Barn Retaining Wall: Ms. Wingate stated there are currently retaining walls and these small extensions will finish the walls off and be functional. The issue of the four steps is based on the landscape design plan. Steps were constructed but not enough to reach the top of the hill, therefore four additional steps are needed. Mr. Roth questioned if retaining walls are allowed in the forest conservation area. Mr. Taylor stated any type of construction is typically not allowed in the forest conservation area. Ms. Wingate stated the Applicant is hoping not to do retaining walls. She said the idea is to put an asphalt curb near the picket fence at the top where the driveway curves so the walls

will not be necessary for stabilization of the slope. The other choice would be to put a railroad tie or landscaping timber at the top to solve the run-off problem. Mr. Taylor commented this can be approved with the stipulation that Staff can obtain verification this is allowed in the forest conservation area. The Commission has no objection.

# 6 – Barn Steps, Railing and Fence: The Commission has no objection.

# 7 – Driveway Retaining Wall: The Commission has no objection.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application as submitted. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Shad moved to Adjourn the meeting. Mr. Roth seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

\*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

---

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

---

Allan Shad, Vice-Chairperson

---

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary